

20



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/497,800	02/04/2000	David Angelo Ferrucci	YO999-202	7920
48150	7590	10/21/2005	EXAMINER	
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/497,800

Applicant(s)

FERRUCCI ET AL.

Examiner

Doug Hutton

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,9-19 and 21-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26-32,36 and 37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,9-19,21-25 and 33-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 February 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 7 July 2005, Applicant amended Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10, 14, 17-19, 25 and 33-35, cancelled Claims 3, 8 and 20, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 7 April 2005.

The objections to Claims 1, 6, 14, 17, 19, 20, 24 and 25 previously set forth are withdrawn. The rejections for Claims 1, 8-13 and 16-18 previously set forth under 35 U.S.C. 101 are withdrawn. The rejections for Claims 18, 22, 25 and 35 previously set forth under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph are withdrawn. The rejections for Claims 1, 3-25 and 33-35 previously set forth under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 are withdrawn.

Specification

The specification remains objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the "***identifying***" of a link expression of the component variable (see Claim 1, Line 8); the "***determining whether the link expression can be identified with an element in a domain model of the document***" (see Claim 1, Lines 9-10); the "***best identity match***" that is performed by the reconciliation algorithm (see Claim 3, Line 3); the "***swapping***" that is performed by the reconciler (see Claim 22, Line 2); and "components" that are "***built from a same domain model***" (see Claim 25, Lines 1-2).

37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) states: "The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims ***must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description***" (emphasis added). MPEP § 608.01(o) states: "***The meaning of every term used in any of the claims should be apparent from the descriptive portion of the specification with clear disclosure as to its import***" (emphasis added). The Specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the terms and phrases identified in the above paragraph so that the meanings of these terms and phrases are ascertainable, as required in 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1), because the "Detailed Description" portion of the Specification fails to mention these terms and phrases. Additionally, the meanings of the terms and phrases identified in the above paragraph are not apparent with clear disclosure as to their import, as required in MPEP § 608.01(o), because the "Detailed Description" portion of the Specification fails to mention these terms and phrases.

Neither the fact that these terms and phrases appear in the original claims nor Applicant's amendment to the "Summary of the Invention" portion of the Specification submitted in the response dated 7 July 2005 obviates this objection because neither provide guidance in determining the meaning of the terms and phrases.

If the descriptive portion of the Specification provides proper antecedent basis for these features of the present invention, then Applicant should point out those particular parts of the Specification.

The disclosure remains objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “*mapped variable A from the document component's (e.g., reference numeral 12) to variable 1 in the container assembly 11*” on Page 13, Lines 12-14 should be amended to — mapped document variable A to container variable 1 — so that the sentence reads more clearly; and
- the phrase “*mapped component variable B to container variable 3 (of the document component 12) in the container assembly 11 (e.g., containing document)*” on Page 13, Lines 20-22 should be amended to — mapped component variable B to container variable 3 — so that the sentence reads more clearly.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings remains objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “*displaying a component variable next to a representation of an element in a domain model of the document*” (Claim 18, Lines 3-4) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

In *Applicant's Response* dated 7 July 2005, Applicant argues that this limitation is shown by *connector 14* in Figures 3 and 5 of the drawings. The examiner disagrees

because *connector 14* fails to show a “**representation of an element in a domain model**.” The examiner sees a “*component variable*” in Figure 3 (in element 12, “Variable A”) of the drawings. However, the examiner cannot locate any “**representation of an element in a domain model**” that is shown in the drawings.

In response to this issue, Applicant should specifically point out the “**representation of an element in a domain model**” that is shown in the drawings. In other words, Applicant should specifically state the figure in which the “representation of an element in a domain model” is located and the exact location of the “representation of an element in a domain model” within that figure.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the number “3” in Line 1 should be amended to — 1 — because Claim 14 should depend from Claim 1.

Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "**allowing** a user to at least one of accept and override said association between the identified component variable and the corresponding container variable" in Lines 9-10 should be amended to — accepting and/or overriding said association between the identified component variable and the container variable, wherein a user interactively performs said accepting and/or overriding — so that the limitation is positively recited and reads more clearly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-17, 22, 25, 33 and 34 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-16, 33 and 34:

Claim 1 recites "***identifying*** a link expression of said component variable; and determining whether the link expression ***can be identified with*** an element in a domain model of the document" in Lines 9-11. These limitations are indefinite because it is unclear what is meant by the term "***identifying***" in Line 9 and the phrase "***determining whether the link expression can be identified with an element in a domain model of the document***" In Lines 10-11.

Although both phrases use a form of the term “*identify*,” the meanings of the two terms appear to be different. The language used in these limitations (Claim 1, Lines 9-11) confuses the reader and obscures the essence of Applicant’s invention, which is automatically mapping component variables to corresponding container variables and allowing a user to either accept or override the mappings. Accordingly, the intended scope of Claim 1 cannot be determined.

Additionally, the phrase in Lines 10-11 fails to further limit the claim. In the Applicant’s Response to the Office Action dated 20 August 2004, Applicant states that the “*link expression*” **defines** a path ***in the domain model***, with the path ultimately landing ***at a domain model element*** (see *Applicant’s Response*, dated 20 October 2004 – Page 19, fourth paragraph). Using this interpretation of the claim language provided by Applicant, the “*link expression*” is already “identified with” a domain model element. Thus, there would be no need to ***determine whether*** the link expression ***can be*** identified with a domain model element, because the link expression already **is** identified with a domain model element.

Claims 33 and 34 include the same confusing limitations (see Claim 33, Lines 8-10 and Claim 34, Lines 10-12). Thus, the above discussion also applies to these claims.

Claims 4-7 and 9-16 are dependent upon Claim 1. Thus, the above discussion also applies to these claims.

Applicant's amendment to Claim 1 in the response submitted 7 July 2005 fails to obviate this rejection because the claim still includes the confusing limitations and the amended claim fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention, as required under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In the examiner's opinion, the first three steps of Claim 1 (and the first three recited elements of Claims 33 and 34) attempt to recite the functions of an **automatic reconciliation module**, wherein the module automatically maps the identified component variable with a corresponding container variable – **if** the identified component variable has a corresponding container variable that refers to the **same domain concept** as the identified component variable.

Also, in the examiner's opinion, the remainder of Claim 1 (and the remainder of Claims 33 and 34) attempts to recite that, if the identified component variable does **not** have a corresponding container variable that refers to the **same domain concept** as the identified component variable, then the module finds a **best identity match** for the component variable, wherein the module maps the identified component variable to the **domain model element of the document** that **best matches** the component variable. In other words, the module **compares** the domain concept of the component variable to the domain concepts of multiple elements in the domain model of the document and maps the component variable to the domain model element that **most closely matches** the domain concept of the component variable. ***Subsequently***, the user may either **accept** the mapping performed by the automatic reconciliation module **or override** the mapping by interactively mapping the identified component variable to a user-selected

domain model element (see Claims 11 and 15 for support of the examiner's interpretation of Claim 1).

If the examiner's opinion of how the present invention operates is incorrect, then the examiner requests that Applicant schedule an interview to discuss the invention.

Applicant must amend the claims to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-17, 33 and 34:

Claim 1 recites "*determining if there is a container variable in a container that refers to **a same domain concept***" in Lines 4-5. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear **to what** the "*domain concept*" of the "*container variable*" is compared to determine whether the "*container variable*" "*refers to a same domain concept*."

Claims 17, 33 and 34 have the same problem. Thus, the above discussion also applies to these claims.

Claims 4-7 and 9-16 are dependent upon Claim 1. Thus, the above discussion also applies to these claims.

Applicant must amend the claims to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Claim 13:

The claim recites “*whether values to be assigned to the variables*” in Line 2. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear whether it refers to the “*container*” variables, the “*component*” variables or both.

The claim also recites “*whether values to be assigned to the variables, once matched*” in Line 2. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear what is “*matched*.” The only “*matching*” previously recited in the claims is recited in Claim 11 – “*interactively **matching** the component variable to an element of the domain model*” (see Lines 3-4). Claim 1 recites that a “*component variable*” and a “*container variable*” are “***associated***,” if the component variable and the container variable refer to the same domain concept (see Lines 4-7).

Applicant should amend Claim 13 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Claim 14:

The claim recites “*a value to be assigned to the variable*” in Line 2. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear whether it refers to a “*container*” variable or a “*component*” variable.

Applicant should amend Claim 14 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Claim 22:

The claim recites “*wherein if the component variable in the component includes a value, **then no swapping is performed by said reconciler***” in Lines 1-2. This limitation is indefinite because is unclear what is meant by this limitation (i.e., the intended scope of the invention as recited in the claim).

Firstly, neither the Specification nor the previous claims mention anything about a “*swapping*” being performed by the reconciler. Secondly, it is unclear **what** is “*not swapped*” by the reconciler. In other words, **what** would not be “*swapped*” if the component variable includes a value?

Applicant may obviate this rejection by deleting the claim.

Claim 25:

The claim recites “*wherein said components **are built from a same domain model***” in Lines 1-2. This limitation is indefinite because is unclear what is meant by this limitation (i.e., the intended scope of the invention as recited in the claim).

The Specification mentions **nothing** about “*components*” being “*built*” from anything. Rather, the Specification ***only*** discloses that “*component variables*” are “*associated with container variables*” when a component variable and a corresponding container variable refer to the same “*domain concept*.”

Applicant may obviate this rejection by deleting the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 18, 19, 21-25 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fong et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,279,015.

Claim 18:

Fong discloses *a computer-implemented method of interactively reconciling component variables with container variables in a document* (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format – e.g., SGML to HTML. Through the interactive mapping, “*component variables*” are “*reconciled*” with “*container variables*” in that both SGML and HTML comprise elements having variables.), *comprising:*

- *displaying a component variable next to a representation of an element in a domain model of the document* (**EXAMINER'S INTERPRETATION** – The examiner interprets a “***representation of an element in a domain model of the document***” simply to be an existing mapping between a “*component variable*” and a “*container variable*.” If the examiner's interpretation is incorrect, then the examiner requests that Applicant schedule an interview to discuss the invention.

In Fong, see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface comprises a graphical user interface that displays the SGML tags and the corresponding HTML elements.),

- *identifying an association between the component variable and said element in the domain model* (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface comprises a graphical user interface that displays the SGML elements and the corresponding HTML elements. By simply displaying the mappings, the GUI “*identifies associations*” between the elements.); *and*
- *matching said element of said domain model interactively by a user* (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format.).

Claim 19:

Fong discloses a *system for reconciling component variables with container variables in a document relative to a domain model* (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format – e.g., SGML to HTML. Through the interactive mapping,

“component variables” are “reconciled” with “container variables” in that both SGML and HTML comprise elements having variables.), comprising:

- *a container including a plurality of container variables (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format – e.g., SGML to HTML. Both SGML and HTML documents include elements having “plurality of variables.”);*
- *a component including a plurality of component variables in said document (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format – e.g., SGML to HTML. Both SGML and HTML documents include elements having a “plurality of variables.”); and*
- *a reconciler that maps container variables in said container, with component variables in said component (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format.),*

wherein said reconciler is manually controlled by a user, to perform a mapping (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this

limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format.).

Claim 21:

Fong discloses *the system according to Claim 19, further comprising:*

- *a controller for automatically controlling said reconciler to perform said mapping* (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the discussion of the prior art automatically mapping a transformation from one structured format to another structured format.).

Claim 22:

Fong discloses *the system according to Claim 19, wherein if the component variable in the component includes a value, then no swapping is performed by said reconciler* (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface performs no “swapping” under any conditions.).

Claim 23:

Fong discloses *the system according to Claim 19, wherein said component includes a plurality of alternative choices for being mapped by said reconciler* (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this

limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format – e.g., SGML to HTML. Both SGML and HTML documents include elements having a “*plurality of variables*.”).

Claim 24:

Fong discloses *the system according to Claim 19, wherein when said component variables in said document include a value and said reconciler is in an on-state, said reconciler reconciles said component variables in said document with said container variables in said container* (see Figures 1-20; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the discussion of the prior art comprises automatically mapping a transformation from one structured format to another structured format, without restricting the conditions under which the mapping is performed. Fong also discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format, without restricting the conditions under which the mapping is performed.).

Claim 25:

Fong discloses *the system according to Claim 19, wherein said components are built from a same domain model and wherein said container variables in said container are reconciled with said component variables in said component* (see Figures 1-20; see

Column 1, Line 1 through Column 44, Line 19 – Fong discloses this limitation in that the mapping interface allows a user to interactively map a transformation from one structured format to another structured format – e.g., SGML to HTML. Both SGML and HTML documents include elements that are “*built from a same domain model.*”).

Claim 35:

Claim 35 merely recites computer software for performing the method of Claim 18. The mapping interface disclosed in Fong operates via computer software. Thus, Fong discloses every limitation of Claim 35, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 18.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-17, 33 and 34 would be allowable if: 1) the claims are amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph; and 2) the objection to the Specification is obviated, all of which are set forth in this Office action.

The following Claims 1, 4-7, 9-16, 33 and 34, drafted by the examiner and considered to distinguish patentably over the art of record in this application, are presented to applicant for consideration.

1. (currently amended) A computer-implemented method of reconciling component variables with container variables in a document, comprising:

- identifying a component variable ~~in a component~~;
- determining if there is a container variable ~~in a container~~ that refers to a same domain concept as the identified component variable;
- if the a container variable is determined to refer to the same domain concept as the identified component variable, associating said component variable ~~in the component~~ with said container variable ~~in the container~~;
- if no container variable is determined to refer to the same domain concept as the identified component variable, associating said identified component variable with an element in a domain model of the document having a best identity match; and
- ~~▪ identifying a link expression of said component variable; and~~
- ~~▪ determining whether the link expression can be identified with an element in a domain model of the document,~~
 - ~~○ wherein said determining whether the link expression can be identified with said element in said domain model of the document uses an automatic reconciliation algorithm to find a best identity match, and~~
 - ~~○ wherein said identifying said link expression of said component variable is performed interactively by a user.~~

- displaying the association between said identified component variable and said container variable or said domain model element to a user,
wherein said user either accepts or overrides said association.

2-3. (cancelled)

4. (previously presented) The method according to Claim 1, wherein said best identity match comprises a direct match.

5. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 1, wherein, with when said best identity match ~~found~~ is determined, the identified component variable in ~~the component~~ is linked with the associated container variable ~~in the domain model~~.

6. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 5, wherein the identified component variable ~~in the component~~ assumes a value of the linked container variable in ~~the a~~ containing document and the identified component variable is positioned in the document with the ~~new~~ value.

7. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 1, wherein said ~~identifying said link expression of said component variable~~ best identity match

matches the identified component variable of ~~the component~~ to the domain model elements of the document to find the best match.

8. (cancelled)

9. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 1, wherein said identified component variable in ~~the component~~ is interactively displayed adjacent to a ~~representation of an element of the domain model of the containing document.~~

10. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 1, wherein a plurality of identified component variables in ~~the~~ a component are interactively displayed adjacent to a ~~representation of elements of the domain model of the containing document.~~

11. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 1, wherein said ~~identifying said link expression of said component variable~~ overriding said association comprises actuating, ~~by a user,~~ a the identified component variable in ~~the component~~ and interactively matching the identified component variable to an element of in the domain model of the document.

12. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 11, wherein said ~~identifying said link expression of said component variable~~ overriding said

association is performed by said user for each multiple identified component variables within the a component.

13. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 12, wherein said user interactively determines whether values to be assigned to the identified component variables, once matched, should be the values in the containing document or the values in the imported components when said imported components has a values.

14. (currently amended) The method according to Claim [[3]] 1, wherein said automatic reconciliation algorithm automatically determines that a value to be assigned to the component variable is the value in the containing document.

15. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 1, wherein [[a]] said user[[.]] overrides said association through a graphical user interface (GUI)[[.]] ~~identifies an association between~~ by associating said component variable and with a domain model element.

16. (currently amended) The method according to Claim 1, wherein [[a]] the user interactively selects a container value.

33. (currently amended) A system for reconciling component variables with container variables in a document, comprising:

- means for identifying a component variable ~~in a component~~;
- means for determining if there is a container variable ~~in a container~~ that refers to a same domain concept as the identified component variable;
- and
- if a container variable is determined to refer to the same domain concept as the identified component variable, means for associating said component variable ~~in the component~~ with said container variable ~~in the container~~;
- if no container variable is determined to refer to the same domain concept as the identified component variable, means for associating said identified component variable with an element in a domain model of the document having a best identity match; and
- ~~▪ means for identifying a link expression of said component variable; and~~
- ~~▪ means for determining whether the link expression can be identified with an element in a domain model of the document.~~
- means for displaying the association between said identified component variable and said container variable or said domain model element to a user.

wherein said user either accepts or overrides said association.

34. (currently amended) A signal-bearing medium tangibly embodying a program of recordable machine-readable instructions executable by a digital processing apparatus to perform a method of reconciling component variables with container variables in a document, said method comprising:

- identifying a component variable ~~in a component~~;
- determining if there is a container variable ~~in a container~~ that refers to a same domain concept as the identified component variable; and
- if a container variable is determined to refer to the same domain concept as the identified component variable, associating said component variable ~~in the component~~ with said container variable ~~in the container~~;
- if no container variable is determined to refer to the same domain concept as the identified component variable, associating said identified component variable with an element in a domain model of the document having a best identity match; and
- ~~identifying a link expression of said component variable; and~~
- ~~determining whether the link expression can be identified with an element in a domain model of the document.~~
- displaying the association between said identified component variable and said container variable or said domain model element to a user,

wherein said user either accepts or overrides said association.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 1, 33 and 34:

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest the combination of limitations recited in suggested Claims 1, 33 and 34.

Claims 1, 4-7 and 9-16:

Theses claims are dependent upon Claim 1 and thus include allowable subject matter.

Claim 17 would be allowable if: 1) the claim is amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph; and 2) the objection to the claim is obviated, both of which are set forth in this Office action.

The following Claim 17, drafted by the examiner and considered to distinguish patentably over the art of record in this application, is presented to applicant for consideration:

17. (currently amended) A computer-implemented method of automatically reconciling component variables with container variable in a document, comprising:

- identifying a component variable in a component;
- determining ~~[[if]]~~ there is a container variable in a container that refers to a same domain concept as the identified component variable;
- ~~if the container variable is determined to refer to the same domain concept~~, associating said component variable in said component with the container variable in the container; and
- ~~allowing a user to at least one of accept and override said association between the identified component variable and the corresponding container variable.~~
- accepting and/or overriding said association between said identified component variable and said container variable.

wherein a user interactively performs said accepting and/or overriding.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 17:

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest the combination of limitations recited in suggested Claim 17.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 18, 19, 21-25 and 35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
October 17, 2005



**DOUG HUTTON
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100**